



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would have been passed over in silence. This defect is very patent to anthropologists; but however grave, it cannot permanently detract from the acknowledged merits of Mr. Markham's excellent translation.

TEXT BOOKS ON ANTHROPOLOGY.*

THE posthumous work of Professor Karl Schmidt is based upon the "Anthropological Letters," written in 1852; but, as the editor M. Oehlmann informs us, is in fact quite a new book.

The first volume consists of *The History of Anthropology*, and in true German style is about all and everything. It is the genuine *History of Man*: for it is concerned with everything which man influences, and by which man is affected. All nations have had their Anthropology; but how will not our orthodox readers be rejoiced with a chapter *On the Anthropology of the New Testament*, or *Jesus Christ and the Anthropology of St. Paul*! Hence, through the Cabala, Philo, and Neo-Platonists, we pass to the schoolmen, through the metaphysical age of Europe down to Kant, and end with John Stuart Mill!

Then we have a long chapter on *The results of the present anatomical, physiological, and ethnographical discoveries*; and a most disproportionate digression on phrenology and physiognomy. This is indeed the province in which the author seems most at home, and as the second volume consists almost entirely of anatomical, or physiological matter, it seems subject of regret that the original title and conception of the book should have been altered to the more ambitious one, which it has no pretence to satisfy.

The ethnographical portion is quite beneath criticism, and we are astonished to find in a learned work that "bleeding roast-beef, fat puddings, brandy and porter, denote the nationality of every son of Britain."

Dr. Schmidt cannot claim to have written a good text book on Anthropology. We do not look under such a title for a meagre history of metaphysics, or rather a catalogue of some of the principal writers thereon; and though there is nothing to say against the anatomical portion of the work, and though the woodcuts strike us as

* Die Anthropologie: Die Wissenschaft von Menschen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und auf ihrem gegenwärtigen Handpunkte. Von Prof. K. Schmidt. 2 vols. Dresden: 1865.

peculiarly elegant, still in all this there is nothing new, even in Germany.

A better hope is held out by Dr. Reich, the first portion of whose work on *The universal science of man*,* has just reached England, if indeed the performance comes up to the boasts of his prospectus. "The author, whose name is known far beyond the limits of Germany, will in his new work lay a foundation on which naturalists and philosophers, physicians and statesmen, teachers and moralists, and all whose interest lies in the study of man, may come together, join hands, and unite." The part we have in hand is taken up with metaphysical discussions on the nature of the soul, with very long extracts from the opinions of the ancients on that subject, and on the position of man in the universe. But Dr. Reich, as he says, "does not bind himself to any chronological order," and the views of Buckle, Büchner (with whom he seems principally to agree), Erdmann, Philo, Lenz, and Huxley, are all pressed into his service as he thinks fit. Altogether, whilst we look with interest for the remaining part from Dr. Reich, we cannot allow that he has been hitherto much more successful than Dr. Schmidt.

The increasing number of books bearing the superscription of this science inspires, however, a hope that before long some durable *Elements*, or *Principles of Anthropology* will be produced. The great mistake to be avoided in such an undertaking is the attempting too much; and the incorporation into the general plan of such isolated portions as the anatomy or physiology of man, which have as everyone knows been already elaborated in a thousand treatises, and for which no one would look under a name which must include much that is entirely independent of all considerations of the physical nature of man, much that is conjectural, and much that is new. However arduous, and indeed hopeless as some would say, such a task must be, no science can be fairly said to take its place as such until it has its acknowledged text book to refer to, as denoting its sphere, and the way it can be taught, or learnt. Not that it is necessary for success that the first grammar of Anthropology should be unimpeachable either in its method or its aims, but that the solitary student should feel satisfied that having mastered its details, his labour will not be entirely thrown away. It is only after a long series of attempts that any science can hope to have its works of reference or its elementary treatises brought to that perfection for which the example of the most advanced branches of knowledge has caused a demand. But young anthropologists should not stand by in idleness till the work is done

* Die Allgemeine Naturlehre des Menschen, etc. Von Eduard Reich, Med. Dr. Erste dieferung. Giessen: 1865.

for them. The opportunity of associating their names with a new science will probably never occur again, and next to the production of a successful novel, there is perhaps nothing so lucrative as the construction of a sound and well-digested text-book.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PARIS ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY.*

At the meeting of December 3, Dr. Pruner-Bey read a very elaborate paper "On the Asiatic origin of Europeans," which was followed by an essay "On the Ethnic Elements of Europe," by M. Lagneau. Neither of these papers admits of an abstract, which we regret the less as the more salient points are touched and commented upon by M. d'Omalus in his reply.

"On the Cranium of Schiller and the cubic index of Crania."

At the meeting of March 17, Dr. Broca, in exhibiting a drawing representing the profile of the cranium of Schiller taken from the second edition of Carus' *Cranioscopic Atlas*, said: The Society will remember that in our discussions on the brain, three years ago, conflicting opinions were expressed relative to the volume of the cranium of Schiller. The contemporaries of that great man said that he had a very large head, and M. Gratiolet in his *Anatomie comparée du Système nerveux* repeated this assertion. But as he had since an opportunity of studying the profile of the cranium of Schiller in the first edition of M. Carus' *Atlas*, he found that the antero-posterior diameter measured only 190 m.m., and thus did not exceed the average as observed in dolichocephalic crania. I then observed that this test was insufficient, inasmuch as the volume of the cranium depends as much on its width and height as in its length. The main question remained, however, unsettled.

The table of measurement which is now added to the second edition of M. Carus' *Atlas* enables us to solve this question. The measures are expressed in inches and lines, the width of the parietal region of the cranium of Schiller amounts to 5 inches 10 lines, equal to 158 millimeters. This cranium is consequently not dolichocephalic; it is, on the contrary, brachycephalic, for the antero-posterior diameter is, as stated by M. Gratiolet, exactly 190 m.m., and in comparing the two diameters we find a cephalic index of 83.16 per cent.

This cranium is, moreover, greatly developed in the vertical line; the

* Continued from vol. ii, p. 161.